

KERCKHOFF LABORATORIES
OF BIOLOGY

Dear John,

Sorry if I got the wires crossed up
somewhere. May I didn't tell you that
DeBruin was the reviewer I don't know.
He just shipped back the stuff having
kept it thinking I was in New York.
His criticisms and suggestions were
the same as yours.

shorten:

- ① cut theoretical derivation*
 - ② cut out 2ndary prototroph graphs
and state results in words
 - ③ Poisson distribution means nothing
 - ④ crossing-over and recombination
- several minor changes in wording
He didn't spot the mating type factor as
being NG.

* He meant completely. Believe that the kinetics
formula should be left since many geneticists
are particulate mathematicians & statisticians
and not kinetics people.

Ryan wrote saying your suggestions were, as usual, excellent and that he did mean to suggest some prototrophs or otherwise recombinants could be proved by plate syntrophy + mutation (which I doubt, at least in large numbers ~ 100-10,000 since the plates won't support ~~that~~ ^{enough} growth to give a good chance for reversion).

The new form is enclosed. I'm out of graphs and my plates haven't arrived from Columbia yet so I hope you have the old paper. Note the changes:

Lessening of evidence for synergism
vs. other hypotheses
increasing the quantitative aspect
agglutination - is it OK to mention
you? It's your idea.

?
Ryan has been sending postcards of beautiful native gals from all parts of SA. He's having such a wondrous time in the jungles that he'll probably become a systematist-collector.

Yours.